

MINUTES
Joint Meeting of the
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
May 6, 2020

The City of Wyoming Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) and Architectural Review Board (ARB) met on Wednesday, May 6, 2020 remotely via the Zoom online video conferencing platform and the meeting was webcast to the public via Facebook Live through the City of Wyoming's Facebook account. The meeting was called to order at 7:17 PM by Bobbie McTurner, Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission. Attendance was as follows:

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Gene Allison
Zach Green
Chris Magee
Bobbie McTurner
Cathy Ramstetter
David Sparks
Jim Walton

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS:

Gene Allison
Mark Browning
Scott Kyle

STAFF:

Megan Statt Blake, Community Development Director
Tana Pyles, Community Development Specialist

OTHERS:

Brian Lockaby, Property Owner of 242 Elm Avenue
William Hamilton, Neighbor at 244 Elm Avenue

REVIEW OF 242 ELM AVENUE – APPLICATION FOR ONE-STORY FRONT PORCH ADDITION ON A PROPERTY LOCATED IN THE VILLAGE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Ms. Statt Blake introduced the request, which is to demolish the existing front porch stoop, and replace it with the proposed one-story porch on the property at 242 Elm Avenue. The property consists of a two-story single-family home built in 1971 and is approximately in the neocolonial style. She explained the property is outside of the period of significance of the Village Historic District, and at the time of historical designation the property was considered an intrusion or non-contributing.

Ms. Statt Blake described the proposal in more detail. She explained the proposed front porch addition spans the full frontage of the house. The porch is a standard four column

design. She stated since this property is considered non-contributing to the Village Historic District, it does not necessarily need review per the *Design Guidelines for Historic Properties*. The Design Guidelines could serve as a guide for reviewing the request if there is an appropriate application.

Ms. McTurner asked Mr. Lockaby if he had additional information to share about the project. Mr. Lockaby shared the intent behind the proposal. He explained his previous house had a large front porch, which allowed his family to interact with their neighbors. They currently have a beautiful backyard but he believes a front porch would be a positive addition to his house and the neighborhood.

Ms. McTurner added that next year the property will be turning 50 years old. At that point the property could be considered historic, however the property would remain a non-contributing structure. She explained the Hamilton County Auditor's website contains photographs of the property and between 1992 to 2003 there was a significant amount work done to the home. The neocolonial as it appears today did not exist in 1971. The existing stoop which the applicant is seeking to demolish is not original to the home. When the home received an extensive exterior renovation sometime in 1990s to early 2000s, the neocolonial elements were added including the dentils, dormers, stoop, painted brick, and modified aluminum siding. Before the renovation the home appeared like a tract home that would be found in other neighborhoods of its era.

The members moved into discussion of Section 1336.04(b) of the Codified Ordinances, specifically this property falls under Subsection 1336.04(b)(1) which states when City Council may approve an application for alteration/demolition of a Historic Property, as follows:

- 1. The building to be Altered or Demolished does not have Historic Significance and/or is Noncontributing within an Historic District or to the Historic Property; the proposed Alteration or Demolition will have no negative effect on the Historical Significance of the Historic District or an Historic Property; and the work as described in the application will leave a safe and presentable site compatible with the appearance of surrounding properties;*

The members agreed the alteration application meets Subsection 1336.04(b)(1).

Mr. Allison shared his comments on the proposed design. He pointed out that the columns on the existing porch have a series of details which lends to the colonial style. The new columns should have similar details. Mr. Browning added the detailing for the new columns as submitted, do not match the detailing on the existing porch. Specifically, the aspect that is missing is a small crown mold at the top of the proposed columns as it connects to the beam. Mr. Lockaby agreed to modify the trim to replicate the existing trim detail on the new columns, which will be painted white.

Mr. Lockaby clarified the porch roof will be hipped on both sides. The front elevation shows an optional hip porch roof, which will be constructed. Mr. Browning and Mr. Kyle agreed a hipped porch is a better design option. Mr. Sparks asked if the porch will be open or if railings

are proposed. Mr. Lockaby stated the porch will not have railings because the height does not require it.

Ms. McTurner inquired as to whether the surround to the door will be changed. Mr. Lockaby stated the front door will be replaced but the existing surround will remain. Mr. Browning questioned if landscaping is proposed to screen the poured concrete slab. Mr. Lockaby explained he has received drawings from a landscape company to landscape the entire frontage. He will plant all new landscaping along the proposed porch and walkway.

Mr. Magee commented that the existing front steps and stoop are clad with brick, which is a nice detail. He asked if Mr. Lockaby had thought about cladding the porch, steps or walkway with brick to keep with the existing design. Mr. Lockaby stated the current walkway will be removed since it runs through the front yard at an angle. The steps and walkway will be replaced with poured, dyed, and stamped concrete and the walkway will lead towards the driveway.

Ms. McTurner asked Ms. Statt Blake if there were recommendations in the Design Guidelines regarding poured concrete front porches and stairs. Ms. Statt Blake explained the Design Guidelines address the treatment of a patio for a historic home. It states materials such as concrete, stone, pavers, and brick could be used but should have an affinity with the house in terms of design, placement, scale, and materials. The house is not currently considered a historic property and the Design Guidelines do not particularly apply in this instance.

Ms. McTurner referenced Section 1336.04(c), which outlines the five items that must be true in order for City Council to approve an application for alteration. Mr. Allison asked if the removal of lead-based paint had been addressed. Ms. McTurner responded that because the house was built in 1971 there is a chance lead-based paint is present. She asked Mr. Lockaby if any testing had been done on the exterior of the house. Mr. Lockaby stated they have not conducted any tests; however, the previous owners had painted 20 years ago. Mr. Browning commented that Ms. McTurner had established the painting of the existing brick and stoop construction had taken place in the late 1990s. Ms. McTurner said by looking at the exterior changes on the Hamilton County Auditor's website, she is doubtful there is any risk of disturbing lead-based paint for the scope of this project. She suggested the applicant keep lead-based hazards in mind for future projects.

Mr. Kyle moved to recommend approval of the one-story front porch replacement construction as proposed, finding that the alteration request would meet the provisions of Section 1336.04(b)-(c).

Mr. Browning seconded the motion, and all members voted yes. The motion passed.

Mr. Lockaby exited the meeting.

A written report on the action of this meeting will be provided to City Council and a public hearing on the proposed alteration is scheduled to be held at the May 18, 2020 City Council meeting. Property owners within 200 feet of this property have been notified via mail of the public hearing. Ms. McTurner will present the alteration request at that meeting.

APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Allison moved to approve the April 2, 2020 HPC-ARB joint meeting minutes, seconded by Mr. Kyle. All HPC and ARB members voted yes. The motion passed.

MISCELLANEOUS

Ms. McTurner mentioned members should begin looking for properties to nominate for preservation awards. She explained that preservation awards do not have to be for a property located within the Historic District but can be any property in the City. For example, last year Chris and Wendy Magee received an award for their mid-century modern located outside of the Village Historic District because the members wanted to highlight one of the many modern buildings within the City.

Ms. McTurner announced the monthly HPC meeting on May 20, 2020 has been cancelled.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Kyle moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Allison. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:46 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Tana Pyles,
Community Development Specialist
Secretary of the May 6, 2020 HPC-ARB meeting

Bobbie McTurner,
Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission

Gene Allison,
Chair of the Architectural Review Board